REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-20 are now pending with claims 1, 9 and 12 being independent. Claim 12 has been amended.

The specification has been amended in response to the Examiner's objection on page 2 of the Office Action mailed April 22, 2004 that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter of claim 6. Thus, the subject matter of claim 6 has been incorporated into the "Detailed Description of the Invention" section of the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim 1 describes an authorization control circuit that includes a digital signal processor to provide digital data output, determine an authorization state, and generate a disable signal. The circuit also includes a digital to analog converter coupled to the digital signal processor that receives the digital data output, converts the digital data to corresponding analog data, output the corresponding analog data, and mute the output of the corresponding analog data. The converter includes an input to receive the disable signal, the converter muting the output of the corresponding analog data in response to the disable signal.

Amended claim 12 describes a method of selectively muting output. The method includes the steps of: generating digital data; determining an authorization state; generating a disable signal; transmitting the digital data to a digital to analog converter; generating an analog signal corresponding to the digital data; transmitting the disable signal to the digital to analog converter; and muting the analog signal in response to the transmitted disable signal.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca et al. (5,612,682) in view of Seo et al. (5,063, 597). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the reason that Deluca and Seo do not describe or suggest the digital to analog converter including an input to receive the disable signal.

Deluca, in the Abstract, teaches a method and apparatus in a communication system operated by a service provider that controls utilization of a module added to a portable communication device including a transceiver which communicates with a fixed portion of the communication system. The portable communication device receives a request for utilization of the module. In response, the portable communication device acts to obtain a usage authorization

for utilizing the module. The portable communication device disallows the utilization of the module, in response to the usage authorization being unobtainable. As admitted by the Examiner in page 3 of the Office Action, Deluca does not describe or suggest the digital to analog converter including an input to receive the disable signal. No part of the Deluca reference describes or suggests a digital to analog converter.

Seo fails to remedy the failure of Deluca to describe or suggest the digital to analog converter including an input to receive the disable signal. Seo, in the Abstract and Figure 3, teaches a muting circuit in a digital audio system having a digital signal processor, a first latch, a second latch, a comparator for comparing data in the first and second latches, an address encoder, a counter, a memory, a divider, a multiplier and a switching circuit. Disturbing beat noises generated during the turning off of power to the system or null data pop noises generated in response to external influences or internal circuitry influences are muted. Seo does not describe or suggest that the digital to analog converter includes an input to receive the disable signal. In Seo, as shown in Figure 3 and explained in column 3, lines 32-49, a switching circuit 39 receives a mute control signal through line 41. The switching circuit 39 also receives an n-bit first and fourth digital data, then selects and outputs selectively the n-bit first or fourth digital data to the digital to analog converter according to the logic state of the mute control signal. Seo does not describe or suggest that the digital to analog converter includes an input to receive the disable signal. Seo teaches that the digital to analog converter receives an n-bit first or fourth digital data that corresponds, respectively, to either the original digitized and processed analog signal 40 or a digitized mute waveform that reaches a zero level as shown in Figure 2c. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Deluca in view of Seo.

Claims 2-8 and 13-20 depend from independent claims 1 and 12, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for claims 2-8 and 13-20 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 12.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca in view of Seo and further in view of Lipovski (6,675,002). However, Lipovski fails to remedy the failure of Deluca and Seo to describe or suggest the digital to analog converter including an input to receive the disable signal. Lipovski makes no mention of a digital to analog converter.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 12.

Claim 9 describes an authorization control circuit that includes a digital signal processor to provide digital data output, determine an authorization state, and generate a disable signal. The authorization control circuit also includes a digital to analog converter coupled to the digital signal processor to receive the digital data output, convert the digital data to corresponding analog data, and output the corresponding analog data. The control circuit includes an analog amplifier to receive the analog output from the converter and generate amplified output. The analog amplifier has an input to receive the disable signal, the amplifier muting the amplified output in response to the disable signal.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Deluca in view of Seo. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the reason that Deluca and Seo do not describe or suggest an analog amplifier having an input to receive the disable signal. Deluca makes no mention of an analog amplifier and Seo in Figure 1 shows an amplifier 10 that receives an analog speech signal through line 11 and outputs the amplified speech signal through line 12. A muting signal 13 connects to switch SW for grounding the output of analog amplifier 10 so that noises are muted. Deluca and Seo do not describe or suggest an analog amplifier having an input to receive the disable signal. Lipovski also does not describe or suggest an analog amplifier having an input to receive the disable signal. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentable over Deluca in view of Seo.

Claims 10-11 depend from independent claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for claims 10-11 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9.

8

In view of these remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

Indranil Chowdhury
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,490

Robert D. Marshall, Jr.
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5290